

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0045440 to Kudoh (hereinafter "Kudoh").

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kudoh in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0204064 to Ikeda et al.

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections summarized above and the Office Action's interpretation of the applied references, and respectfully requests reconsideration of this application, withdrawal of all rejections, and the timely allowance of all pending claims.

All Claims Comply with 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e) and 103(a)

Claims 1-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kudoh. Applicant traverses these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Applicant respectfully submits that Kudoh does teach at least a "control means...a plurality of controllers for sensory means...wherein said control means sends an operation command signal...to said plurality of controllers for sensory means in common..." as recited in independent claim 1.

Kudoh teaches a mobile communication terminal whereby controller 1 reads melody data for producing melody sounds and outputs the melody data to melody sound source 2. Melody

sound source 2 outputs the waveform of a melody to amplifier 8, which outputs sounds from speaker 9. (Pg. 2, para. [0027]). At the same time that the melody is played, melody sound source 2 outputs an LED drive signal to LED driver 10 and outputs a vibrator drive signal to vibrator 12. (Pg. 2, para [0028]).

The Office Action appears to relate the control means of the claimed invention to CPU 1 and 2 (i.e., controller 1 and melody sound source 2) of Kudoh and the plurality of controllers for sensory means as items 1, 2, 10, and 12 of Kudoh (Pg. 2, section 2). However, neither the controller 1 nor the melody sound source 2 send a **single common signal** (e.g., “operation command signal”) to the plurality of controllers for sensory means as required by independent claim 1. Instead, Kudoh teaches sending a separate signal for each controller of sensory means, that is, “an LED drive signal to LED driver 10” and “a vibrator drive signal to vibrator driver 12.” (Pg. 2, para. [0028]).

As pointed out in MPEP § 2131, “[t]o anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim.” Thus, “[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 2 USPQ 2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).”

Furthermore, according to MPEP § 2143.03, “[to] establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. In re Royka, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974).”

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn. For reasons similar to those stated above,

Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of independent claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn. Moreover, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 2 and 4-5 are allowable at least because of their dependency from independent claims 1 and 3 and the reasons set forth above.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: _____

Bradford A. Cangro

Reg. No. 58,478

Dated: July 14, 2006

Customer No.: 009629

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20004

Telephone: 202-739-3000

Facsimile: 202-739-3001